

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 21 have been amended.

Claim 13 has been canceled, whereby many of the features of that claim are now incorporated into independent claims 1 and 21.

Claim 23-25 have been added.

Claims 1-12 and 14-25 are now pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10 and 13-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,571,401 (Lewis 1) or U.S. Patent No. 6,290,911 (Lewis 2) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,720,862 (Hamamoto et al.), U.S. Patent No. 5,658,443 (Yamamoto et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,103,033 (Say et al.) or U.S. Patent No. 6,784,274 (Van Antwerp et al.); and claims 7, 8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,720,862 (Hamamoto et al.), U.S. Patent No. 5,658,443 (Yamamoto et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,103,033 (Say et al.) or U.S. Patent No. 6,784,274 (Van Antwerp et al.), and further in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,572,826 to De Witt et al. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action recognizes that Lewis 1 and 2 differ from the claims in not disclosing coating a first conductive layer and then a second non-conductive polymer layer (Office Action, page 4, lines 4-5). The Office Action asserts that Hamamoto et al., Yamamoto et al., Say et al. and Van Antwerp et al. teach coating a first conductive layer and then a non-conductive layer instead of a blended composition.

Without comments on the merits of these assertions made in the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 21 have each been amended to include certain features of the “post processing” steps of claim 13, now canceled.

In its rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 10 and 13-22, the Office Action does not mention the features of claim 13, whereby such features are not believed to be taught or suggested by any of the cited art of record, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 21 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 15 and with respect to new claim 23, which recites the same features as recited in claim 15, the Office Action does not address the features of those claims at all in the Office Action, whereby those claims recite: forming at least one sensor in the array of sensors to have a star-shaped configuration and forming at least another sensor in the array of sensors to have a spiral-shaped configuration. Note that page 4 line 33 to page 5, lines 3 of the specification states that a spiral sensor configuration and a start sensor configuration represent an advancement over prior art designs, and thus are not mere design choices.

Accordingly, claims 15 and 23 are patentable for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above with respect to their respective base claim.

Still further, new claims 24 and 25 recite the features of now-canceled claim 13 that were not added to independent claims 1 and 21, whereby those features are also believed to provide a separate basis of patentability for those claims, beyond the reasons given above with respect to their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this response, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 5, 2007
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5535
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,819